

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Lisa Azzou, as guardian and natural parent on)
behalf of her minor daughter **S.A.**,)
) Case No. 2:22-cv-12932
Plaintiff,)
v.)
)
YM Inc., a Canadian corporation for profit,)
)
Defendant.)

NOW COMES Lisa Azzou, as guardian and natural parent on behalf of her minor daughter S.A., by and through the undersigned counsel, Owen B. Dunn, Jr. and Valerie J. Fatica, Counsel for Plaintiff, who hereby files this Complaint against YM Inc., a Canadian corporation for profit, for injunctive relief, damages, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* ("ADA"), alleging as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This action is brought by the Plaintiff, Lisa Azzou on behalf of her minor child S.A. and individuals similarly situated, pursuant to the enforcement provision of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the "ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), against the Defendant as delineated herein.
2. The Court has jurisdiction pursuant to the following statutes: 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which governs actions that arise from the Defendant's violations of Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*; 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which gives the District Courts original jurisdiction over civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States; 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3) and (4), which gives District Courts jurisdiction over actions to secure civil rights extended by the United States government; and 28 U.S.C. §

1367, as Count II utilizes the same core of operative facts as Count I, and is therefore subject to supplemental jurisdiction.

3. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Michigan as venue lies in the judicial district of the property *situs*. The Defendant's property and/or operations, as complained of by Plaintiff, are located in this judicial district, where the business of public accommodation is conducted, including the acts complained of herein.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff, Lisa Azzou is the guardian and natural parent of her minor daughter S.A.
5. S.A., is a female born on October 29, 2008, is an Oakland County, Michigan resident, and the minor child qualifies as an individual with disability as defined by the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2), 28 C.F.R. 36.104.
6. Defendant **YM Inc.**, upon information and belief, owns or operates the property located at 37700 Six Mile Rd., #H-680, Livonia MI 48152 in Laurel Park Mall in Wayne County, Michigan, which is a Charlotte Russe retail store. Plaintiff, together with her minor daughter S.A., have patronized Defendant's property and the facilities thereon previously as a place of public accommodation, and she has experienced the barriers to access complained of herein.
7. Upon information and belief, the facility owned or operated by the Defendant is non-compliant with the remedial provisions of the ADA. As Defendant either owns, leases, leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104, Defendant is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. Defendant's shopping center is a place of public accommodation. Defendant's property fails to comply with the ADA

and its regulations, as also described further herein.

8. S.A. is a child diagnosed with spina bifida, hydrocephalus, Chiari malformation, sleep apnea, and neurogenic bladder and permanently uses a wheelchair for mobility. As such, she is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to, standing and walking, as defined by the ADA and its regulations thereto. Lisa Azzou is her mother.
9. On June 20, 2022 and previous occasions, S.A. and her mother visited the property that forms the basis of this lawsuit and plan to return to the property to avail herself of the goods and services offered to the public at the property.
10. During the Plaintiff's visits to Defendant's property, she encountered architectural barriers at the subject property that violate the ADA and its regulations. The barriers to access at the property have endangered Plaintiff's safety.
11. Plaintiff has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to this property as described but not necessarily limited to the allegations contained in this complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that she will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by the Defendant. Plaintiff desires to visit the Defendant's place of business again on future occasions, not only to avail herself of the goods and services available at the property but to assure herself that this property is in compliance with the ADA so that she and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the shopping center without fear of discrimination.
12. The Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages

and/or accommodations of the buildings, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 *et seq.*

13. The Defendant has discriminated, and is continuing to discriminate, against the Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing to, *inter alia*, have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less).
14. A preliminary inspection of the facility owned or operated by Defendant has shown that many violations of the ADA exist at the subject property. These violations include, but are not limited to:

Access to Goods and Services:

- A. At least 5% of fitting rooms are not accessible, whereas the store offers 6 fitting rooms and none are handicap accessible, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.
- B. The fitting rooms' doors swing into the limited interior clear floor space making them impossible to enter for a wheelchair, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.
- C. Clothing hooks in the fitting rooms are located above allowable reach range, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.
- D. The fitting rooms' do not have the required turning space for customers who use mobility aids, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.
- E. There is not a fitting room bench as required, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.

F. Upon the addition of an accessible fitting room, it should be marked with a permanent signage designation, whereas now there is none.

G. Merchandise racks block the store entrances creating a dangerous condition as well as being too narrow of width for a wheelchair to navigate, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.

Policies and Procedures:

H. The Defendant lacks or has inadequate defined policies and procedures for the assistance of disabled patrons, in violation of the ADA whose remedy is readily achievable.

15. The discriminatory violations described in Paragraph 14 by the Defendant are not an exclusive list of the ADA violations believed to exist at the place of public accommodation. Plaintiff requires further inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and all of the barriers to access. The Plaintiff, has been denied access to Defendant's accommodations; benefit of services; activities; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendant, as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

COUNT I
VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

16. Plaintiff restates the allegations of ¶¶1-15 as if fully rewritten here.
17. The retail store, as owned or operated by Defendant, is a place of public accommodation and service establishment, and as such, must be, but is not, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") or Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG").
18. Plaintiff was unlawfully denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, and advantages of the property on the basis of disability due to Defendant's failure to comply with Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act and its accompanying regulations, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182, *et seq.* Defendant will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the facilities, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the retail store accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities, including Plaintiff.
19. The Plaintiff, and others similarly-situated, is presently without adequate remedy at law and is being damaged by irreparable harm. Plaintiff reasonably anticipates that she will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions, and ADA violations that exist at the Facility, including those set forth herein.
20. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12187, Plaintiff requests that the Court issue an injunction requiring Defendant to make such readily achievable alterations as are legally required to provide full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, and advantages on its property to disabled persons. In connection with that relief, Plaintiff requests reasonable attorney's fees and costs of maintaining this action.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF MICHIGAN PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES CIVIL RIGHTS ACT
M.C.L. § 37.1301 et seq.

21. Plaintiff restates the allegations of ¶¶1 - 20 as if fully rewritten here.
22. Charlotte Russe, a retail store, is a "place of public accommodation" pursuant to M.C.L. §37.1301(a).
23. Defendant committed an unlawful act pursuant to M.C.L. §37.1302(a) by denying Plaintiff full enjoyment of its goods, services, accommodations, advantages, facilities, or privileges by failing to provide equal access to people with mobility impairments. More specifically, all of the available fitting rooms are inaccessible to customers who use wheelchairs and could not accommodate the Plaintiff and her minor child. Also, the store entrance was blocked by merchandise racks which required a store clerk to move in order to enter and exit the retail store.
24. As an accommodation, the store manager offered to allow Plaintiff to try on the merchandise in the mall public restroom which Plaintiff declined due to less sanitary conditions. Ultimately however, the manager arranged with another store nearby to use their accessible dressing facility which the Plaintiff accepted and proceeded to make a purchase at Charlotte Russe.
25. While the manager and clerks should be commended for their efforts, the Plaintiff should not have to endure this discrimination while shopping when able bodied persons are accommodated with changing room facilities within the store.
26. Pursuant to M.C.L. §37.1606, Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory and exemplary damages, and attorneys' fees and costs, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event not less than \$25,000.00, as well as issuance of an injunction requiring Defendant

to allow full and equal enjoyment of its goods, services, facilities, privileges, and advantages to disabled persons.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands,

For **COUNT I**, an injunction requiring Defendant to make all readily achievable alterations and institute policies and procedures to allow full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, and advantages to disabled persons, and the reasonable attorneys fees and costs of maintaining this action; and,

For **COUNT II**, compensatory and exemplary damages, attorney's fees and costs, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event not less than \$25,000.00, as well as issuance of an injunction requiring Defendant to allow full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, and advantages to disabled persons.

Respectfully Submitted,

Counsel for Plaintiff:

/s/ Owen B Dunn Jr.

Owen B. Dunn, Jr., Esq. (p66315)
Law Office of Owen B. Dunn, Jr.
The Ottawa Hills Shopping Center
4334 W. Central Ave., Suite 222
Toledo, OH 43615
(419) 241-9661 – Phone
(419) 241-9737 – Facsimile
Monroe, MI: (734) 240-0848
dunnlawoffice@sbcglobal.net